The Respondent also contends that the Board's decisions stand for the proposition that employees have the right to have certification decisions heard on their merits. The Board has made no such holding or suggestion. If, by way of the example cited in the Respondent's brief, the class representative misses a filing deadline, nothing in any of the Board's cases suggests a court must nonetheless decide class certification on the merits.

As to the Respondent's assertion that there is no basis in the NLRA, the Federal Rules, or case law for *D .R. Horton's* presumption that class procedures were created to serve any concerns or purposes under the NLRA, the Board has not relied on such concerns or purposes. Two employees who together file charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) about racial harassment are engaged in concerted activity about their working conditions, though the EEOC's charge processing procedures were certainly not created to serve any concerns or purposes under the NLRA. The EEOC's procedures, like class procedures in court, are one of many avenues available for concerted legal activity, regardless of the purposes those procedures were intended to serve.

The Respondent next appears to be arguing that employees can, albeit in vain, file putative class action lawsuits despite the MAA, suffer no adverse consequences for it, and therefore the MAA does not infringe on their rights. There need not be adverse consequences for non-adherence to the MAA for it to violate the Act. Moreover, the MAA on its face spells out adverse consequences for filing putative class actions. The MAA states, in relevant part:

> Should any party institute any action in a court of law or equity against the other party with respect to any Dispute required to be arbitrated under this Agreement, the responding party shall be entitled to recover from the initiating party all costs, expenses, and attorney fees incurred to enforce this Agreement and compel arbitration, and all other damages resulting from or incurred as a result of such court action.

Thus, in addition to breaking an agreement with the employer not to sue as an express condition of continued employment, an employee who files a putative class action may be assessed with fees and damages.

The Respondent also contends that the Board in *D. R. Horton* misinterpreted the *Norris-LaGuardia Act* (NGLA) when determining it prohibits the enforcement of agreements like the FAA. The Board recently reaffirmed its position that the FAA must yield to the NLGA, stating

> The Board has previously explained why "even if there were a direct conflict between the NLRA and the FAA, the Norris-LaGuardia Act . . . indicates that the FAA would have to yield insofar as necessary to accommodate Section 7 rights." An arbitration agreement between an individual employee and an employer that completely precludes the employee from engaging in concerted legal activity clearly conflicts with the express federal policy declared in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That conflict in no way depends on whether the agreement is properly characterized as a condition of employment. By its plain terms, the Norris-LaGuardia Act sweepingly condemns "*[a]ny* undertaking or promise . . . in conflict with the public policy declared" in the statute: insuring that the "individual unorganized worker" is "free from the interference, restraint, or coercion of employers . . . in . . . concerted activities for the purpose of . . . mutual aid or protection," including "[b]y all lawful means aiding any person participating or interested in any labor dispute who . . . is prosecuting, any action or suit in any court of the United States or any state."

On Assignment Staffing Services, supra, slip op. at 10 (Emphasis in original, internal citations and footnotes omitted.)

2. The MAA as an employment contract

The Charging Party also asserts that the FAA does not apply because there is no employment contract, citing to the Supreme Court's decisions in *Circuit City Stores Inc. v. Adams*, 532 U.S. 105, 113–114 (2001), *Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegna*, 546 U.S. 440, 445 (2006), and *Allied-Bruce Terminix Companies, Inc. v. Dobson*, 513 U.S. 265, 277 (1995).[7] The Charging Party points out that the MAA itself states, "[t]his Agreement is not, and shall not be construed to create, a contract of employment, express or implied, and shall not alter Employee's at-will employment status." The employees' at-will status is also set forth in the introductory paragraph of the employee handbook. (Jt. Exh. I p. 5; Jt. Exh. J p. 5.)

The Charging Party notes that the Respondent has not offered evidence or argument that a contract of employment has been created by virtue of the MAA in any of the states where it operates. Resolution of this issue would involve delving into each state's body of contract law.[8] Because it is not required to support my conclusion herein that the MAA violates Section 8(a)(1), I decline to undertake this enormous task, the legal aspects of which none of the parties have addressed in their briefs.

[7] The Charging Party also asserts that MAA, when coupled with the Respondent's confidentiality policy, solicitation policy, loitering policy, email usage policy, computer usage policy, and/or return of company property policy, provide other bases for finding it unlawful. I agree that these policies, when viewed in conjunction with the MAA, act as further barriers to employees discussing their arbitrations under the MAA and/or garnering support from fellow employees. The complaint, however, does not allege that any policy other than the MAA violates the Act, and therefore my conclusions are limited to the MAA. See *Penntech Papers*, 263 NLRB 264, 265 (1982); *Kimtruss Corp*., 305 NLRB 710, 711 (1991).

The Charging Party sets forth numerous other arguments, including the FAA's impact on other federal and state statutes, the rights of workers to organize under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), and the effect of the MAA on union representation. I have considered each argument in the Charging Party's brief. Because this case can be decided by applying the Board precedent discussed above, I do not address all of the Charging Party's arguments.

[8] For example, under Minnesota law, the disclaimer language in the MAA may negate the existence of a contract. See *Kulkay v. Allied Central Stores, Inc*., 398 N.W.2d 573, 578 (Minn.Ct.App.1986). By contrast, in *Circuit City*, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit determined the dispute resolution agreement at issue, with disclaimer language almost identical to the agreement at issue here, was an "employment contract." *Circuit City Stores, Inc. v. Adams*, 194 F.3d 1070 (1999); See also *Ashbey v. Archstone Property Management, Inc*., 2015 WL 2193178 (9th Cir. 2015).

3. The MAAs and commerce

The Charging Party argues that there is no evidence the individual MAAs with the Respondent's employees affect commerce, and asserts that the activity of arbitration does not affect interstate commerce. This raises the fundamental question of what, in fact, is the "transaction involving commerce" the MAA evidences to bring it within the FAA's reach?

The FAA, at 9 USC § 2, applies to a "written provision in any maritime transaction or a contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration a controversy thereafter arising out of such contract or transaction . . ." Specifically excluded, however, are "contracts of employment of seamen, railroad employees, or any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce." 9 USC § 1. The Supreme Court in *Circuit City* interpreted this exclusionary provision, "any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce," narrowly, and held it applied only to workers actually working in commercial industries similar to seamen and railroad employees. Relying on *Allied-Bruce Terminix Companies, Inc. v. Dobson*, 513 U.S. 265 (1995),[9] the Court in *Circuit City* interpreted Section 2's inclusion provision, a "contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce," broadly, finding it was not limited to transactions similar to maritime transactions.[10] In line with these interpretations, most contracts of employment fall within the FAA's reach, regardless of whether the employees themselves are involved in any traditionally-defined commercial transactions as part of their work.

In *Allied-Bruce Terminix*, supra, the Supreme Court examined the phrase "evidencing a transaction" involving commerce and determined that "the transaction (that the contract 'evidences') must turn out, *in fact* . . . [to] have involved interstate commerce[.]" (emphasis in original). A prior Supreme Court case, *Bernhardt v. Polygraphic Co. of America*, 350 U.S. 198 (1956), that like *Circuit City* and *Allied-Bruce Terminix* interpreted the words "involving commerce" as broadly as the words "affecting commerce,"[11] involved an employment contract between Polygraphic Co., an employer engaged in interstate commerce, and Norman Bernhardt, the superintendent of Polygraphic Co.'s Vermont plant. The employment contract at issue contained a provision that in case of any dispute, the parties would submit the matter to arbitration by the American Arbitration Association.

The Supreme Court found the FAA did not apply because the company did not show that the employee, "while performing his duties under the employment contract was working 'in' commerce, was producing goods for commerce, or was engaging in activity that affected commerce, within the meaning of our decisions."[12]

[9] The Court in *Allied-Bruce* found that the term "involving" was the same as "affecting" and that the phrase "'affecting commerce' normally signals Congress' intent to exercise its Commerce Clause powers to the full." 513 U.S. at 273–275.

[10] Though I am bound by the majority's decision in *Circuit City*, I find the dissenting opinions, and in particular Justice Souter's explanation of why the Court's "parsimonious construction of § 1 of the . . . FAA . . . is not consistent with its expansive reading of § 2," more sound and compelling. Presumably the result of adherence to precedent, the phrase "contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce" is not seen as a residual phrase following the specific category of maritime transactions in § 2, but the phrase "any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce" is seen as a residual phrase following the specific categories of seamen and railroad employees in § 1. This distinction supplied the Court's rationale for applying the maxim *ejusdem generis* to "any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce" to support its finding that employment contracts are covered by the FAA. "Maritime transactions" is defined in § 1 by way of listing various transactional contracts, such as charter parties, bills of lading, and agreements relating to supplies and vessels. Applying *ejusdem generis*, the expansive definition given to the phrase "contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce," fails to give independent meaning to the term "maritime transaction."

[11] *Allied-Bruce Terminix*, supra, at 277.

[12] The agreement provided for the employment of Bernhardt as the superintendent of Polygraphic Co.'s lithograph plant in Vermont. Its terms stated:

"Subject to the general supervision and pursuant to the orders, advice and direction of the Employer, Employee shall have charge of and be responsible for the operation of said lithographic plant in North Bennington, shall perform such other duties as are customarily performed by one holding such position in other, same or similar businesses or enterprises as that engaged in by the Employer, and shall also additionally render such other and unrelated services and duties as may be assigned to him from time to time by Employer.

"Employer shall pay Employee and Employee agrees to accept from Employer, in full payment for Employee's services hereunder, compensation at the rate of $15,000.00 per annum, payable twice a month on the 15th and 1st days of each month during which this agreement shall be in force; the compensation for the period commencing August 1, 1952 through August 15, 1952 shall be payable on August 15, 1952. In addition to the foregoing, Employer agrees that it will reimburse Employee for any and all necessary, customary and usual expenses incurred by him while traveling for and on behalf of the Employer pursuant to Employer's directions.

"It is expressly understood and agreed that Employee shall not be entitled to any additional compensation by reason of any service which he may perform as a member of any managing committee of Employer, or in the event that he shall at any time be elected an officer or director of Employer.

"The parties hereto do agree that any differences, claim or matter in dispute arising between them out of this agreement or connected herewith shall be submitted by them to arbitration by the American Arbitration Association, or its successor and that the determination of said American Arbitration Association or its successors, or of any arbitrators designated by said Association, on such matter shall be final and absolute. The said arbitrator shall be governed by the duly promulgated rules and regulations of the American Arbitration Association, or it its successor, and the pertinent provisions of the Civil Practice Act of the State of New York relating to arbitrations [section 1448 et seq.]. The decision of the arbitrator may be entered as a judgment in any court of the State of New York or elsewhere.

"The parties hereto do hereby stipulate and agree that it is their intention and covenant that this agreement and performance hereunder and all suits and special proceedings hereunder be construed in accordance with and under and pursuant to the laws of the State of New York and that in any action special proceedings or other proceeding that may be brought arising out of, in connection with or by reason of this agreement, the laws of the State of New York shall be applicable and shall govern to the exclusion of the law of any other forum, without

Here, the contract at issue is the MAA.[13] There is no other employment contract implicated in the complaint or the answer.[14] By virtue of the MAA, the employee and employer have transacted an agreement to resolve employment disputes through arbitration. What is analytically more difficult about the MAA and similar agreements, when compared with most contracts, is that the arbitration agreement itself is part of the consideration for the transaction. The agreement here states that the "Mutual Arbitration Agreement . . . is made in consideration for the continued at-will employment of the Employee, the benefits and compensation provided by Company to Employee, and Employee's and Company's mutual agreement to arbitrate as provided in this Agreement."[15] (Jt. Exh. I p. 55; Jt. Exh. J p. 56.) Generally, when a contract is involved, the arbitration agreement is a means to solve a contract dispute, and the terms of the agreement spell out independent consideration. For example, in *Allied-Bruce Terminix*, consideration for the termite bond at issue was money. In *Buckeye Check Cashing*, individuals entered into "various deferred-payment transactions with . . . Buckeye . . . in which they received cash in exchange for a personal check in the amount of the cash plus a finance charge." 546 U.S. at 440. In *Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp*., 500 U.S. 20 (1991), the arbitration agreement was part of an application to register with the New York Stock Exchange. In none of these cases was the agreement to arbitrate itself consideration in the "contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce."

The MAA's terms, including the "consideration" of the individual arbitral process, are not implicated until there is an employment dispute. In other words, an employment dispute is a condition precedent to performance under the MAA. In typical transactions, a dispute is not necessary for the terms of the agreement to be exercised. For example, in *Buckeye*, the check cashing company provided cash to the individuals as consideration for the individuals signing over their checks and paying a fee. These transactions could play out indefinitely without the arbitration agreement provision ever coming into play. If the individuals in *Buckeye* performed their end of the bargain by turning over their checks and the check cashing company sat idle, a dispute would arise. Conversely, there would be no need for the check cashing company to do anything if the individual never presented it with a check to cash. Not so here, if the employees' work is part of the consideration. At all times prior to the advent of a covered dispute and the invocation of a way to resolve it, the employer is continuing to employ the employee and the employee is continuing to perform work for the employer. Continued employment triggers no duty on the employer or the employee with regard to the MAA.[16] The employee deciding not to continue employment with the Respondent, without more, likewise triggers no duty under the MAA. It is difficult to see, therefore, how continued employment is part of the "transaction" the MAA evidences.

Simply put, the MAA is a contract about how employment disputes will be resolved. The "transactions" evidenced by the MAA are agreements to arbitrate any and all employment disputes. Yes, the MAA is a condition of employment, but its topic is not the work the employees will perform or the conditions under which they will perform it. An employer engaged in interstate commerce could require employees, as a condition of employment, to sign an agreement stating that they will sit with their coworkers for lunchtime on Tuesdays.[17] The topic of this agreement is not the employee's work duties or the employer's business, but rather who the employees will eat lunch with on Tuesdays. It certainly would seem a stretch to find that this agreement would be a "maritime transaction or a contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce."

As noted above, the MAA applies to all employees. As the Charging Party points out, some disputes covered by the MAA with some of these employees would likely affect commerce, and other minor disputes likely would not. Take the example of a security worker who walks a block to work (not across state lines) at the same Hobby Lobby store each day. It is hard to see how an individual arbitration, required by the MAA, about a disagreement over the timing of this security worker's lunch break evidences any transaction involving commerce. The fact that the employer is engaged in interstate commerce does not, in my view, render any individual agreement to arbitrate an employment dispute as a "contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce" because it is not the employer's business of producing and selling goods in interstate commerce comprising the "transaction" evidenced by the MAA. To interpret the FAA this broadly would finally stretch it to its breaking point.[18]

---

regard to the jurisdiction in which any action or special proceeding may be instituted." 218 F.2d 948, 949–950 (2d Cir. 1955).

[13] I have not been asked to decide whether the entire employee handbook is a contract, and make no findings on this point.

There is no evidence here of any contract setting forth payment, duties, etc. of the various employees' jobs, as in *Bernhardt*. This renders the interpretation in this decision narrower than in *Bernhardt* because I am not looking at a broader employment contract, with an agreement to arbitrate disputes embedded in it, and whether that contract has been breached based on the terms of that contract. Instead, I am looking at whether any employment dispute covered by the contract, here the MAA, evidences a transaction involving commerce.

[14] It strikes me as peculiar that the contract to arbitrate itself is the contract at issue to determine applicability of the FAA, rather than an external contract or agreement subject to an arbitration provision. In most cases, the arbitration agreement would kick in if there was a dispute as to performance under the terms of the agreement. Here, a dispute regarding performance under the terms of the MAA would concern whether the employee submitted a covered dispute to arbitration in line with the MAA, or breached the agreement by filing a lawsuit in court.

[15] Oddly, by this language the MAA is in part made in consideration for itself.

[16] Moreover, as the Respondent asserts, employees who have filed class and/or collective lawsuits have not been disciplined, much less been terminated.

[17] Of course, there would be a clause stating that any disputes over this policy would be subject to arbitration.

[18] Many of the Supreme Court Justices, for example, believe the FAA was stretched too far when the Court determined it applied to state court claims. *Southland Corp. v. Keating*, 465 U.S. 1 (1984), Justice O'Connor, joined by Justice Rehnquist, dissenting; See also *Allied-Bruce Terminex*, supra., Justice O'Connor concurring ; Justice Scalia dissenting; Justice Thomas, joined by Justice Scalia, dissenting. Others

Even if the "transaction" the MAA contemplates is employment or continued employment under the MAA's terms, the individual agreements do not necessarily "evidence a transaction involving commerce." As in *Bernhardt*, not all of the Respondent's employees, while performing their duties, are "'in' commerce, . . . producing goods for commerce, or . . . engaging in activity that affect[s] commerce . . . ."

Consideration of the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc*., 539 U.S. 52 (2003), does not lead to a different finding. In *Citizen's Bank*, the Court stated, "Congress' Commerce Clause power 'may be exercised in individual cases without showing any specific effect upon interstate commerce' if in the aggregate the economic activity in question would represent 'a general practice . . . subject to federal control.'" 539 U.S. at 56–57, quoting *Mandeville Island Farms, Inc. v. American Crystal Sugar Co*., 334 U.S. 219, 236, (1948). Citizens Bank and Alafabco, a fabrication and construction company, entered into debt-restructuring agreements that contained an agreement to arbitrate any disputes. The Court rejected the argument that the individual transactions underlying the agreements did not, taken alone, have a "substantial effect on interstate commerce." Id. at 56. First, the Court found that Alafabco engaged in interstate commerce using loans from Citizens Bank that were renegotiated and redocumented in the debt-restructuring agreements. Second, the loans at issue were secured by goods assembled out-of-state. Finally, the Court relied upon the "broad impact of commercial lending on the national economy [and] Congress' power to regulate that activity pursuant to the Commerce Clause." The arbitration agreements between the Respondent and the individual employees in this case do not fall within any of these rationales.

The Charging Party, pointing out that the FAA derives its authority from the Commerce Clause, cites to *National Federation of Independent Businesses v. Sebelius*, 132 S.Ct. 2566 (2012). *Sebelius* discusses the Commerce Clause in relation to Affordable Healthcare Act's (ACA) provision requiring individuals to buy health insurance, commonly known as the individual mandate. In describing the reach of the Commerce Clause in *Sebelius*, the Court observed, "Our precedent also reflects this understanding. As expansive as our cases construing the scope of the commerce power have been, they all have one thing in common: They uniformly describe the power as reaching 'activity.'" The Court determined that the "activity" at issue with regard to the individual mandate was the purchase of healthcare insurance, and that under the Commerce Clause, Congress was not empowered to regulate the failure to engage in this activity. Under this analysis, the "activity" the MAA concerns is resolution of employment disputes. For the reasons described above, this "activity" does not necessarily affect interstate commerce, particularly in cases where no dispute with regard to employment under the MAA ever arises.

Based on the foregoing, I agree with the Charging Party that the Respondent has made no showing that an arbitration agreement between the Respondent and any of its individual employees affects commerce.[19]

4. Team truckdrivers

The Charging Party further argues that team truck drivers who transport the Respondent's products across state lines are a class of workers engaged in interstate commerce, and therefore fall within FAA's exception at 9 U.S.C. § 1. The Court in *Circuit City* held that "Section 1 exempts from the FAA only contracts of employment of transportation workers." The interstate truck drivers are clearly transportation workers, a fact not disputed by the Respondent, and therefore are exempt from the FAA. Requiring the team truck drivers to sign and adhere to the MAA therefore violates the Act, regardless of the Board's decisions in *D. R. Horton* and related cases.

B. Enforcement of the MAA

Complaint paragraphs 4(e) and 5 allege that the Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act by enforcing the MAA, as detailed above.

It is well settled that an employer violates Section 8(a)(1) by enforcing a rule that unlawfully restricts Section 7 rights. See, e.g., *NLRB v. Washington Aluminum Co*., 370 U.S. 9, 16–17 (1962); *Republic Aviation Corp. v. NLRB,* 324 U.S. 793 (1945).

Here, it is undisputed that the Respondent enforced the MAA by filing motions to compel individual arbitration in *Fardig* and *Ortiz*, as detailed above. (Jt. Exhs. Y, Z). The Respondent contends that the Board lacks authority to enjoin the Respondent's motions to compel because they are protected by the First Amendment under *Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. NLRB*, 461 U.S. 731, 741 (1983), and *BE&K Construction CO. v. NLRB*, 536 U.S. 516 (2002). I find that instant case falls within the exception set forth in Bill Johnson's at footnote 5, which states in relevant part:

> It should be kept in mind that what is involved here is an employer's lawsuit that the federal law would not bar except for its allegedly retaliatory motivation. We are not dealing with a suit that is claimed to be beyond the jurisdiction of the state courts because of federal-law preemption, or a suit that has an objective that is illegal under federal law. Petitioner concedes that the Board may enjoin these latter types of suits. . . . Nor could it be successfully argued otherwise, for we have upheld Board orders enjoining unions from prosecuting court suits for enforcement of fines that could not lawfully be imposed under the Act, see *Granite State Joint Board, Textile Workers Union*, 187 N.L.R.B. 636, 637 (1970), enforcement denied, 446 F.2d 369 (CA1 1971), rev'd, 409 U.S. 213, 93 S.Ct. 385, 34 L.Ed.2d 422 (1972); *Booster Lodge No. 405, Machinists & Aerospace Workers*, 185 N.L.R.B. 380, 383 (1970), enforced

believe it was stretched too far when it was held to apply to employment contracts. *Circuit City,* supra, Justice Stevens, joined by Justices Ginsburg, Breyer, and Souter, dissenting; Justice Souter, joined by Justices Stevens, Ginsburg and Breyer, dissenting.

[19] As the party asserting the FAA as an affirmative defense, the Respondent has the burden of proof to show that the agreements at issue are subject to the FAA. The assertion of the FAA as an affirmative defense requires me to address its reach in this decision. Though, as the Respondent notes, many courts have disagreed with the Board's rationale in *D. R. Horton*, et. al., the precise issue of whether a particular agreement to arbitrate is a "maritime transaction or a contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce" has not been squarely addressed.

> in relevant part, 148 U.S.App.D.C. 119, 459 F.2d 1143 (1972), aff'd, 412 U.S. 84, 93 S.Ct. 1961, 36 L.Ed.2d 764 (1973), and this Court has concluded that, at the Board's request, a District Court may enjoin enforcement of a state-court injunction "where [the Board's] federal power preempts the field." *NLRB v. Nash-Finch Co.*, 404 U.S. 138, 144, 92 S.Ct. 373, 377, 30 L.Ed.2d 328 (1971).

The Board has determined that these exceptions apply in the wake of *Bill Johnson's* and *BE&K Construction*. See, e.g., *Allied Trades Council (Duane Reade Inc.)*, 342 NLRB 1010, 1013, fn. 4 (2004); *Teamsters, Local 776 (Rite Aid)*, 305 NLRB 832, 835 (1991). Moreover, particular litigation tactics may fall within the exception even if the entire lawsuit may not be enjoined. *Wright Electric, Inc.*, 327 NLRB 1194, 1195 (1999), enfd. 200 F.3d 1162 (8th Cir. 2000); *Dilling Mechanical Contractors*, 357 NLRB 544 (2011). As such, since the Board has concluded that agreements such as those comprising the MAA explicitly restrict Section 7 activity, the Respondent's attempt to enforce the MAA in state court by moving to compel arbitration fall within the unlawful objective exception in *Bill Johnson's*. See *Neiman Marcus Group*, supra.

The Respondent argues that numerous courts have found agreements such as the MAA to be lawful and enforceable. While this is true, the Board has held that agreements such as the MAA violate the Act, and the Supreme Court has not ruled otherwise. The Respondent, by its actions in court, is challenging Board case law which very clearly holds the MAA violates the Act. The motion to compel arbitration, which by virtue of the MAA can only be on an individual basis, is the crux of the challenge. Inherent in this challenge are risks, which the Respondent is assuming by declining to follow the Board's case law as it works its way through the system.

C. The MAA and Board Charges

Complaint paragraphs 4(b) and 5 allege that the Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) by maintaining, at all material times since at least April 28, 2014, which would reasonably be read by employees to prohibit them from filing unfair labor practice charges with the Board.

The *Lutheran Heritage* test set forth above applies to this allegation. I find that employees would reasonably construe the MAA as restricting their access to file charges with the Board.

The MAA is worded very broadly, and explicitly states it applies to "any dispute, demand, claim, controversy, cause of action, or suit (collectively referred to as "Dispute") that Employee may have" at any time that that "in any way arises out of, involves, or relates to Employee's employment" with the Respondent. This would certainly encompass an unfair labor practice charge with the Board.

More specifically, the MAA includes disputes involving:

> wrongful termination, wages, compensation, work hours, . . . sexual harassment, harassment and/or discrimination based on any class protected by federal, state or municipal law, and all Disputes involving interference and/or retaliation relating to workers' compensation, family or medical leave, health and safety, harassment, discrimination, and/or the opposition of harassment or discrimination, and/or any other employment-related Dispute.

Certainly, disputes about wrongful termination, wages, compensation, and hours could comprise unfair labor practice claims. Discrimination based on Section 7 activity also is encompassed by this language.

The MAA then proceeds to state it applies to disputes under various federal laws, ending with a catchall that it applies to disputes under :

> all other federal, state, and municipal statutes, regulations, codes, ordinances, common laws, or public policies that regulate, govern, cover, or relate to equal employment, wrongful termination, wages, compensation, work hours, invasion of privacy, false imprisonment, assault, battery, malicious prosecution, defamation, negligence, personal injury, pain and suffering, emotional distress, loss of consortium, breach of fiduciary duty, sexual harassment, harassment and/or discrimination based on any class protected by federal, state or municipal law, or interference and/or retaliation involving workers' compensation, family or medical leave, health and safety, harassment, discrimination, or the opposition of harassment or discrimination, and any other employment-related Dispute in tort or contract.

That this would encompass some claims under the NLRA requires no explanation. The only claims explicitly excluded are benefits under unemployment compensation laws or workers' compensation laws.

The Respondent contends that the MAA would not be interpreted to apply to Board charges because of the following language:

> By agreeing to arbitrate all Disputes, Employee and Company understand that they are not giving up any substantive rights under federal, state or municipal law (including the right to file claims with federal, state or municipal government agencies).

The Respondent contends that because of the explicit statement that claims with federal, state, or municipal agencies are excluded from the MAA, any misinterpretation of the MAA would be manifestly unreasonable. I disagree.

To begin with, the MAA specifically states claims of sexual harassment, harassment and/or discrimination based on any class protected by federal law are subject to mandatory individual arbitration. These are all patently clear examples of claims that arise under the civil rights statutes the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) enforces, i.e., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.[20] Yet the MAA also states that nothing would preclude an employee from filing a charge with a federal agency, ostensibly including the EEOC.[21] The only way to reconcile these two provisions is to read the MAA as not precluding filing a charge with an ad-

[20] These statutes are respectively codified at 42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.; 42 U.S.C. 121-1 et seq; and 20 U.S.C. 633a.

[21] The EEOC's charge-filing process is described at http://eeoc.gov/employees/howtofile.cfm.

ministrative agency, yet in the end those disputes must be resolved only through final and binding arbitration under the MAA rather than through whatever fruits filing a charge or other similar effort may bear. The same rationale holds true for Board proceedings, given that the MAA requires individual arbitration of disputes over "wrongful termination, wages, compensation, work hours." This begs the question: Why would any employee bother to file a charge? A reasonable employee, not versed in how various federal, state, and local agencies process claims, would take it at face value that the topics specifically included as falling within the MAA would be subject to arbitration. This is particularly true given that the MAA explicitly excludes benefits under unemployment compensation laws or workers' compensation laws, but not under the NLRA.

Considering that ambiguities must be construed against the drafter of the MAA, which is the Respondent, I find the MAA violates Section 8(a)(1) because employees would reasonably believe the MAA requires arbitration of employment-related claims covered by the Act. See *Aroostook County Regional Ophthalmology Center*, 317 NLRB 218 (1995).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

(1) The Respondent, Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc., is an employer within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

(2) The Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act by maintaining and enforcing a mandatory arbitration agreement (MAA) requiring all employment-related disputes to be submitted to individual binding arbitration.

(3) The Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act when it enforced the MAA by asserting the MAA in litigation the Charging Party brought against the Respondent.

(4) The Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act by maintaining a mandatory arbitration agreement that employees reasonably would believe bars or restricts their right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board.

REMEDY

Having found that the Respondent has engaged in certain unfair labor practices, I shall order it to cease and desist therefrom and to take certain affirmative action designed to effectuate the policies of the Act.

As I have concluded that the MAA is unlawful, the recommended order requires that the Respondent revise or rescind it in all of its forms to make clear to employees that the arbitration agreement does not constitute a waiver of their right to maintain employment-related joint, class, or collective actions in all forums, and that it does not restrict employees' right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board. The Respondent shall notify all current and former employees who were required to sign the mandatory arbitration agreement in any form that it has been rescinded or revised and, if revised, provide them a copy of the revised agreement. Because the Respondent utilized the MAA on a corporatewide basis, the Respondent shall post a notice at all locations where the MAA, or any portion of it requiring all employment-related disputes to be submitted to individual binding arbitration, was in effect. See, e.g., *U-Haul Co. of California*, supra, fn. 2 (2006); *D. R. Horton,* supra, slip op. at 17; *Murphy Oil*, supra.

I recommend the Respondent be required to notify the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California in *Ortiz v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.,* 2:13-cv-01619-TLN-DAD (E.D. Cal.), and the U.S. District Court for the Central District of *California in Fardig v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc*., 8:14-cv-00561-JVSAN (C.D. Cal.), that it has rescinded or revised the mandatory arbitration agreements upon which it based its motion to dismiss these actions and to compel individual arbitration of the claims, and inform the court that it no longer opposes the actions on the basis of the arbitration agreement.

I recommend the Company be required to reimburse employees for any litigation and related expenses, with interest, to date and in the future, directly related to the Company's filing its motion to compel arbitrations in *Ortiz v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc*., 2:13-cv-01619-TLN-DAD (E.D. Cal.), and *Fardig v. Hobby Lobby Stores*, Inc., 8:14-cv-00561-JVSAN (C.D. Cal.). Determining the applicable rate of interest on the reimbursement will be as outlined in *New Horizons*, 283 NLRB 1173 (1987), (adopting the Internal Revenue Service rate for underpayment of Federal taxes). Interest on all amounts due to the employees shall be computed on a daily basis as prescribed in *Kentucky River Medical Center*, 356 NLRB 6 (2010).

On these findings of fact and conclusions of law and on the entire record, I issue the following recommended[22]

ORDER

The Respondent, Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, with a place of business in Sacramento, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

1. Cease and desist from

(a) Maintaining a mandatory arbitration agreement that employees reasonably would believe bars or restricts the right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board.

(b) Maintaining and/or enforcing a mandatory arbitration agreement that requires employees, as a condition of employment, to waive the right to maintain class or collective actions in all forums, whether arbitral or judicial.

(c) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed to them by Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

(a) Rescind the mandatory arbitration agreement in all of its forms, or revise it in all of its forms to make clear to employees that the arbitration agreement does not constitute a waiver of their right to maintain employment-related joint, class, or collective actions in all forums, and that it does not restrict employees' right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board.

(b) Notify all current and former employees who were required to sign the mandatory arbitration agreement in any form

[22] If no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections to them shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

that it has been rescinded or revised and, if revised, provide them a copy of the revised agreement.

(c) Notify the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California in *Ortiz v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 2:13-cv-01619-TLN-DAD (E.D. Cal.), and the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in *Fardig v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 8:14-cv-00561-JVSAN (C.D. Cal.), that it has rescinded or revised the mandatory arbitration agreement upon which it based its motions to dismiss the class and collective actions and to compel individual arbitration of the employees' claim, and inform the respective courts that it no longer opposes the actions on the basis of the arbitration agreement.

(d) In the manner set forth in this decision, reimburse the plaintiffs who filed suit in *Ortiz v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 2:13-cv-01619-TLN-DAD (E.D. Cal.), and *Fardig v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 8:14-cv-00561-JVSAN (C.D. Cal.), for any reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation expenses that she may have incurred in opposing the Respondent's motion to dismiss the wage claim and compel individual arbitration.

(e) Within 14 days after service by the Region, post at all facilities in California the attached notice marked "Appendix A," and at all other facilities employing covered employees, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix B."[23] Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 31, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. In addition to physical posting of paper notices, the notices shall be distributed electronically, such as by email, posting on an intranet or an internet site, and/or other electronic means, if the Respondent customarily communicates with its employees by such means. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. In the event that, during the pendency of these proceedings, the Respondent has gone out of business or closed the facility involved in these proceedings, the Respondent shall duplicate and mail, at its own expense, a copy of the notice to all current employees and former employees employed by the Respondent at any time since April 28, 2014.

(f) Within 21 days after service by the Region, file with the Regional Director a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that the Respondent has taken to comply.

Dated, Washington, D.C. September 8, 2015

APPENDIX A

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated Federal labor law and has ordered us to post and obey this notice.

FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

Form, join, or assist a union

Choose representatives to bargain with us on your behalf

Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection

Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities.

WE WILL NOT maintain a mandatory arbitration agreement that our employees reasonably would believe bars or restricts their right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board.

WE WILL NOT maintain and/or enforce a mandatory arbitration agreement that requires our employees, as a condition of employment, to waive the right to maintain class or collective actions in all forums, whether arbitral or judicial.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of the rights listed above.

WE WILL rescind the mandatory arbitration agreement in all of its forms, or revise it in all of its forms to make clear that the arbitration agreement does not constitute a waiver of your right to maintain employment-related joint, class, or collective actions in all forums, and that it does not restrict your right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board.

WE WILL notify all current and former employees who were required to sign the mandatory arbitration agreement in all of its forms that the arbitration agreement has been rescinded or revised and, if revised, we will provide them a copy of the revised agreement.

WE WILL notify the courts in which the employees filed their claims in *Ortiz v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 2:13-cv-01619-TLN-DAD (E.D. Cal.), and *Fardig v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 8:14-cv-00561-JVSAN (C.D. Cal.), that we have rescinded or revised the mandatory arbitration agreement upon which we based our motion to dismiss her collective wage claim and compel individual arbitration, and we will inform the court that we no longer oppose the employees' claims on the basis of that agreement.

WE WILL reimburse the plaintiffs in *Ortiz v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 2:13-cv-01619-TLN-DAD (E.D. Cal.), and *Fardig v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 8:14-cv-00561-JVSAN (C.D. Cal.), for any reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation expenses that she may have incurred in opposing our motion to dismiss her collective wage claim and compel individual arbitration.

HOBBY LOBBY STORES, INC.

The Administrative Law Judge's decision can be found at www.nlrb.gov/case/20–CA–139745 or by using the QR code below. Alternatively, you can obtain a copy of the decision from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570, or by calling (202) 273–1940.

[23] If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

APPENDIX B

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated Federal labor law and has ordered us to post and obey this notice.

FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

Form, join, or assist a union

Choose representatives to bargain with us on your behalf

Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection

Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities.

WE WILL NOT maintain a mandatory arbitration agreement that our employees reasonably would believe bars or restricts their right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board.

WE WILL NOT maintain and/or enforce a mandatory arbitration agreement that requires our employees, as a condition of employment, to waive the right to maintain class or collective actions in all forums, whether arbitral or judicial.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of the rights listed above.

WE WILL rescind the mandatory arbitration agreement in all of its forms, or revise it in all of its forms to make clear that the arbitration agreement does not constitute a waiver of your right to maintain employment-related joint, class, or collective actions in all forums, and that it does not restrict your right to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board.

WE WILL notify all current and former employees who were required to sign the mandatory arbitration agreement in all of its forms that the arbitration agreement has been rescinded or revised and, if revised, we will provide them a copy of the revised agreement.

HOBBY LOBBY STORES, INC.

The Administrative Law Judge's decision can be found at www.nlrb.gov/case/20–CA–139745 or by using the QR code below. Alternatively, you can obtain a copy of the decision from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570, or by calling (202) 273–1940.

CIRCUIT RULE 30(d) CERTIFICATION

I certify that all of the materials required by Circuit Rules 30(a) and 30(b) are respectively included in the Appendix bound with this brief and the Joint Appendix Volumes 1 and 2 of Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc. and the Committee to Preserve the Religious Right to Organize.

s/Ron Chapman, Jr.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 20th day of December, 2016, I caused this BRIEF FOR APPELLANT. to be filed electronically with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System, thereby serving:

Ms. Valerie L. Collins, Attorney

Ms. Linda Dreeben, Attorney

Joseph F. Frankl, Attorney

Ms. Elizabeth A. Heaney, Attorney

Yasmin Macariola, Attorney

David A. Rosenfeld, Attorney

s/Ron Chapman, Jr.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to FED. R. APP. P. 32(g), I certify that this Brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B) and Circuit Rule 32(c) because this Brief contains 13,989 words, excluding the parts of the brief excluded by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f).

I further certify that this Brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because this Brief has been prepared using Century Schoolbook 14-point font, a proportionately spaced typeface.

Dated this 20th day of December, 2016.

s/Ron Chapman, Jr.

27920702.1